

REMARKS

1. Reconsideration and further prosecution of the above-identified application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and discussion that follows. Claims 1-55 are pending in this application.

Claim 25 has been objected to for certain informalities. Claims 1-18 and 19-36 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 1-5, 8-24, 27-42 and 45-55 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,192,050 to Stovall in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,021,428 to Miloslavsky and U.S. Pat. No. 5,958,014 to Cave. Claims 6-7, 25-26 and 43-44 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Stovall in view of Cave, Miloslavsky and U.S. Patent No. 6,657,282 to Gerber et al. After a careful review of the claims (as amended), it has been concluded that the rejections are in error and the rejections are, therefore, traversed.

2. Claim 25 has been objected to for certain informalities. In response, the informalities have been corrected as suggested by the Examiner.

3. Claims 1-18 and 19-36 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In response, independent claims 1, 18, 19, 20 and 37 have been amended to explicitly provide support for "the determined type of question".

4. Claims 1-5, 8-24, 27-42 and 45-55 have been rejected as being obvious over Stovall in view of Miloslavsky and

Cave. In this regard, the independent claims are limited to the method step of (and apparatus for) "searching for an agent of the plurality of agents in a context where a terminal of the agent functions as a web site and where the activated audio-access icon functions as an additional search term".

Newton's Telecom Dictionary (18th Ed.) asserts that "Any machine on the Internet that is running a Web Server to respond to requests from remote Web Browsers is a Web Site". As such, an agent terminal functioning as a web site would also include the functionality of a web server.

The use of a help request as an additional search term would be recognized as a significant innovation over the teachings of the combination of Stovall, Miloslavsky and Cave. For example, providing agent terminals that function as web sites allows the information search process of the original web site to operate as part of a continuous process. The treatment of the help request as an additional search term allows the search process (and agent selection) to be controlled by the Internet user rather than by the web site owner. In addition, providing agent terminals in the context of a web site supports this functionality in that it allows "the user to hit the 'back' button on his Internet screen and return to the previous web page" (specification, page 11, lines 16-18). As would be well known to those of skill in the art, this is not a feature of Internet voice plug-ins.

In contrast, Stovall and Cave are directed to conventional call routing techniques. Instead of dealing with help requests, Miloslavsky merely matches key words from e-mails with key words in an agent skills list. Since Miloslavsky merely matches key words between e-mails and

agents skills lists, there would be no searching based upon information content. In addition, information searching would be recognized to be a far more complex process than mere word matching.

With regard to Miloslavsky, the Examiner makes the bald statement that "the agent terminal is function of web site because it received an incoming call" (Office Action of 1/26/05, page 5). However, as demonstrated above, the Miloslavsky agent terminal is not a web site because it does not have the functionality of a web site and more specifically of a web server. Since the Miloslavsky agent terminal is not a web site, the combination fails to teach each and every claim limitation.

Since the combination fails to teach or suggest the feature of agent terminals that function as web sites or the use of a help request as an additional search term, the rejections are believed to be improper. Since the rejections are improper, they should be withdrawn.

5. Claims 6-7, 25-26 and 43-44 have been rejected as being obvious over Stovall in view of Cave, Miloslavsky and Gerber et al. However, a review of Gerber et al. reveals that Gerber et al. also fails to provide any teaching or suggestion of providing agent terminals that function as web sites or of using the help request as an additional search term. As such, the combination of Stovall, Cave, Miloslavsky and Gerber et al. fails to teach each and every claim limitation. Since the combination fails to teach each and every claim limitation, the rejection is believed to be improper and should be withdrawn.

6. Allowance of claims 1-55, as now presented, is

believed to be in order and such action is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of the subject application, he is respectfully requested to telephone applicant's undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,
WELSH & KATZ, LTD.


By

Jon P. Christensen

Registration No. 34,137

March 3, 2005
WELSH & KATZ, LTD.
120 South Riverside Plaza
22nd Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 655-1500